Persistent Thomas!

This will be my last comment on anything having to do with Burkley, the autopsy orx anything relevant to them.

You speak like a man of socialist belief. Than you repeat all that Burkley nonsense for all the world as though it will be a revelation to me. Or of some probative significance, or evidentiary. But have you never heard of Camelot? Or the Ameriform royalty?

I would urge Thomas of Occam upon you, not needless conspiracies. How many conspiracies can there be, how vast can any one be? And why see them where they serve no purpose?

I will not undertake to prove anything to you, as you demand. I have the book done and I have more than exhausted the primitive suggestions you have made, as I gave you to understand more than once. So drop it and all of this self-indulgence, please.

Thank you, we again have water, I have a $500 bill and a wellpit yet to put in plus a truckload of stones for the driveway and then that is done.

I have limited use of the left hand temporarily, until this evening's unveilling of the damage I did to it for the second time in two years Sunday. I am less a machetero than Che. But I've continued to provide most of our heat with wood, including the trash it is not safe to burn after trimming the trees out. After reading your letter I cut what it will take to keep us going for two days before a shorter reply.

When you get to your mention of the SWP you get into a different area. Three of us have two different interests in this, literary and leggl. There are things you can do. However, if you are going to be as you have been in this Burkley-autopsy matter I'll go not farthur. You also are free to do as you will. I think it more than likely you can help all of us but I will have terms, you may regard them as unreasonable, and I will have no complaint. I have no right to impose and conditions on you. I believe I do have a right to stipulate conditions dictated by the interests for which I would speak and to expect you to adher to them.

So, if you want to write a memo for a couple of friends, God speed you and goodby.

If you would be willing to just help, it will be with three different byt cooperating lines of inquiry, one book pretty certainly, anothhex possibly, and in helping develop what might be used in a suit that is planned but is not ready for filing. I am the litigant in prospect.

The Oswald angle is only one. I don't think you will be able to get moreon it but it could be helpful. The SWP people have been unwilling to talk to their own on this, and that is their right. I know those who have tried.

The current litigation is of considerable interest. It may yield what can be of help in both writing and suing. I will not be ablw to repay the cost of xeroxing but one of the other two will duplicate for both.

What I will supply is the Comintelpros papers as they are released and we can get them copied. The first set I do have. They are so poor in quality I'll have to get them copied from the copies of which mine are copies or they'll be entirely illegible. The second set has been released but I do not yet have it.

The actuality is they tell us nothing new, not in essence. We knew for years these things were being done. This merely confirms part. I suspect with a few errors, as in beginning date.

Aside from your willingness to not spread around what you might get for us, and I recognize you may be unwilling, there are several other problems. For one thing it is not possible to separate the intrests of the three parties, so where one may not feel restraints are necessary, the others may and one does. On literary interests, I regard mine as lesser but on what can have any involvement in anything legal I regard them as preeminent and could run no chances. I would rather do without than run any such risk, for many reasons. And as I have indicated and will not enlarge upon because I do not intend offense, in the past you have trusted those I regard as entirely unworthy of any trust. You have had one set of experiences on which you xxxxx draw, I another. If you had no reason to find someone dangerous and I did, that does not mean this someone is not dangerous. It means you had no reason to experience and see and understand what I did.

I am not saying your experience is invalid or your judgement bad. I am saying both are irrelevant because we have been in different positions. You have lived 70 years and in the course of it have developed a certain confidence in your own judgement. That is natural enough. You have had your experiences, I have had mine. On this subject, it is an exceedingly unpleasant truth that no other has had my experiences. These have conditioned me. If I have not learned all that is possible from them, what I have learned sticks.

It is also tragic that when there have been hassles, I have been right. Others find this unwelcome. You see, I also begin with a different set of experiences. They, not some unique genius I do not pretend, explains these kinds of things.

My interests are not academic. I have no desire to write memos for a few friends, although I do with regularity where they are active workers.

You perhaps do not understand that the prospects of doing much more with the 26 are not promising. So, those who can now do original work or can contribute to the work of others must have sources other than the 26 available except in a few cases. This means exceedingly few people.

And it is a major tragedy. It forecloses such brilliant minds as Sylvia's.

But it is reality and it is the reality with which we have to cope.

If you are willing to do an occasional check at the New Your Public Library, which I assume is one of the better ones at least in its main branch, there may from time to time be things I would ask of you, but again, it would be on a confidential basis. The kinds of things that might make no sense at all to you, like getting all the listings on a certain street in a certain city for certain years, meaning xeroxes of those pages.

If this stipulation of complete confidentiality is not uncongenial, I have one in mind right now. But I do mean COMPLETE confidentiality, and I would like you to consider that where interests are not academic hazards also are not.

I have been the subject of improper federal interest. If I do not know the magnitude, I am in possession of some proofs. The fact is beyond question, the extent is not.

And I am well into areas of which you have no knowledge and of which I can give you none.

If this sounds paranoid, arrogant, self-important and just plain foolish, I will not undertake to prove it. But I do have copies of some of the suvreillance and plenty of proofs of others.

And in court I am currently causing pain.

So, I do not believe that when I ask certain agreements it is, from my point of view or my special interests, unreasonable.

No objection to your disagreement.

3/15 P.S. Had to suspend. Among the experiences I referred to on which I draw are others than from the work of the past decade. Before I was old enough to vote I was part of a Senate investigation of labor spies and anti-labor violence. I have worked and lived with the FBI and DJ lawyers on decent cases. I was in intelligence in World War II. I did do significant investigative reporting on other matters, including of an intelligence nature. I worked with British intelligence before becoming part of our own. Please don't ask me to ingore what I learned on your whim or to forget it for any other reason with what I am now engaged upon. Thd cautions I have urged upon you are all valid. I hope you will recognize this and not engage upon what is almost certain to be counter-productive, which would not be your intent.

Sincerely,